

1 just gives the Court something more to mull over.

2 In my view, my understanding of subversive,  
3 the kind of subversive I am disturbed about, wouldn't  
4 care about what we put in as a matter of oath, if they  
5 could accomplish their means. The oath doesn't mean  
6 anything to a real subversive and it seems to me that the  
7 shorter we make this Constitution, without going on  
8 record as favoring leniency for those who want to over-  
9 throw our Government by force, the less we say about it,  
10 the better.

11 THE CHAIRMAN: Any further discussion?

12 I wanted to comment only on one thing and that  
13 is the use of the word, advocates. I was involved in a  
14 case a few years ago where the question at issue was  
15 whether or not an employer, a large employer, had acted  
16 properly in discharging persons who were members of the  
17 Communist Party. This issue came up and it was pointed  
18 out in the course of the litigation through the Federal  
19 Courts that the only practical way, in many instances,  
20 to determine one's advocacy of overthrow of the Government  
21 by force and violence was by membership in an organiza-